

Parking Plan comments

The City should be axing minimum parking in areas with existing good transit. In areas with future good transit, the developer should be able to reduce the amount of parking they need to build by providing a relatively small contribution of \$5k or \$10k per spot they won't build. This will allow the City to encourage development towards areas with existing good transit, while helping gather funds to improve transit for areas with future good transit. Maximum parking requirements are unnecessary for the City of Brampton because the cost to build parking is so high, developers are unlikely to overbuild parking. It is okay if some of the earlier buildings along the Queen Street Corridor have more parking than later phases, different people will want different amounts of parking, and we should ensure there is variety in unit configurations.

This report found that parking is being heavily subsidized in downtown, which is something I have been telling Council for years, and which the City has procrastinated and done nothing because it wants to see the report, which confirms what I have told you. Because the City has procrastinated for many years on this file, the report is effectively recommending tripling the monthly parking cost in a span of a few months. If you had acted with foresight, you could have raised it by \$20 a year, instead of \$80 in one year. In 2009, the Downtown Parking Strategy estimated the John Street garage would need to charge \$211 per month to break even, adjusted for inflation that is \$292 per month, as such, \$120 per month is still enormously subsidized. Instead of increasing it immediately to \$120, I instead recommend the City to increase it by \$20 on 1 January, and by \$20 every 6 months thereafter until July 2026, and reassess at that point. Such a phase in will allow people who live or work downtown sufficient time to adapt.

Regarding the DBBIA requesting 2 hour free parking, and for freezing hourly rates I substantially agree, keeping the shorter time periods cheaper encourages people to visit downtown and patronize businesses. Because of how expensive the hourly rate is currently, relative to the absurdly cheap monthly parking pass, if the City is going by \$20 increases per 6 months, there would not be a need to increase hourly rates until January 2026. As the Region of Peel currently lists Mid 2025 as the completion timeline, this will allow the rates to be effectively frozen until after construction completes. The daily rate could be raised to \$14, which at \$2 per hour, and 2 hours free would cap out at 9 hours being parked, effectively the entire day, and would only rather rarely affect visitors.

The City does not need to do a feasibility study, we do not need to have a study tell us to do a study to do a feasibility study to do pilot, the City can simply proceed with calculating parking revenues, keeping half for the City, with a requirement that it is all spent downtown, and the other half goes to the DBBIA for uses downtown. My family has helped a number of people resettle in Brampton, sometimes from other provinces, sometimes from abroad. When we have taken them downtown, they have noticed how poorly maintained the downtown is, this is due to a lack of funding for ongoing maintenance. A parking benefits district helps the City ensure it has a sustainable source of funding to maintain the downtown. The DBBIA getting funding is the spoonful of sugar to make the medicine go down, and helps the fund efforts to improve the downtown, whether that is with beautification efforts, enhanced cleaning, better maintenance,

live programming, or hiring more security downtown to make people feel safe. Arcadis IBI's comment on turnover is irrelevant, because the parking downtown does not get full, so cars parked excessively long does not impair business.

The City should immediately move to allow overnight parking to the holders of monthly passes. Overnight parking should have been permitted years ago, there was no clear reason why it has not implemented, other than waiting on a study which was obviously going to recommend it.

The fixation on parking structures in the parking plan is a clear sign they do not understand the situation in Brampton, for X capital dollars, it is always going to be more cost efficient to spend it on procuring buses than in building structured parking, when it comes to servicing the core areas. In addition to it being outright cheaper to fund buying buses than construct parking structures, there are also significant equity issues. Structured parking is going to primarily benefit wealthier residents, and buses would benefit primarily poorer residents, so spending money on parking structures instead of buses is stealing from the poor to give to the rich. A single articulated bus running the 501 Queen route will service more people in a day than a 200 car parkade.

The City could also build the core of a bikeshare system for the cost of a 200 car parkade. I have spent over a year advocating for a bikeshare system, which this report also considers, instead we have spent years waiting for a report for something that was obvious.

The City should properly establish a carshare system, I requested this years ago and the 2015 TMP contemplated it. Instead of establishing it, we spent years waiting around for a study which was obviously going to recommend it.

Because of the incredibly bad ratio of cost to transportation capacity of parking, using Community Benefits Charges is morally and intellectually bankrupt. The Parking CIP for Employment is also absolutely absurd, it would make more sense to offer free bus passes for a decade. Free bus passes for a decade would cost approximately as much as half the \$25k capital grant cap.

Curbside parking permits should be introduced, and start expensive, such as \$80 per month, or more, to help fund enforcement, and also to disincentivize heavy usage of the program. Over time it should grow to be at least as expensive as a monthly bus pass, if not more. An additional \$5 million in parking revenue could do wonders for expanding bylaw parking enforcement.

Signing leases with developers for downtown parking is likely to be unnecessary, and to impede effective use of parking downtown. Allocating the parking to one developer may preclude a later development from being able to properly utilize the excess parking to build less parking in their development, and directing parking demand to the municipal garages.

When one looks at exhibit 5, it becomes clear that it is impossible to predict the parking utilization in 2040, because of how massively assumptions factor into utilization such as remote

work usage, population, and whether the parking garage closes. It is likely they have significantly underestimated the population, which would significantly revise upwards the amount of parking needed, but they have also underestimated future transit mode share as they are basing it off the Citywide guess from the 2015 TMP. If usage outpaces parking capacity, then the City ought to raise rates faster, until such a time as usage gets to around 85%. It is only once the monthly parking passes surpass \$400 that it could be conceivable to profit off of building more parking. The consultant report says "Offering such permits may be considered in the future if overnight residential parking demand reaches a significant level." How exactly do they propose measuring if there is significant demand for it if it isn't permitted? Why not simply allow it now?

Proposed potential parking sites

Site 1: The City should acquire this land along with Site 6 to build the grade separated crossing, and surface parking lots. The surface parking lot for site 1 will enable the redevelopment of the large surface parking lots at the apartment buildings to the southwest of the sites.

Site 7: the value of a municipal surface parking lot at Centre and the CN corridor is not for downtown, it would be to facilitate redevelopment of the area around the Centre Street MTSA

The so called case for parking system expansion.

The report fails to fully consider the effects of price on demand for parking, it also fails to consider the impact of transportation demand management. Parking demand at \$120 per month and at \$300 per month are likely to be significantly different. If the City also uses the higher rates to offer subsidized transit passes to employees, given the current 50% discount employees get on transit passes, \$1m/year would be enough to provide transit passes to over a thousand employees a year. If this sounds expensive consider that their projected expenses for a parkade assume an \$8,000 per year subsidy per spot, over \$4m a year for 550 spots.

Sylvia Roberts